



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/197,844	11/23/1998	GAD JANAY	030	1758

7590 10/18/2005

KAPLAN & GILMAN
COUNSELORS AT NORTH
900 ROUTE 9 NORTH
WOODBIDGE, NJ 07095

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/197,844

Applicant(s)

JANAY, GAD

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 8/4/2005.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-18 are pending in the case. Claims 5, 10-11, and 15 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus et al, hereinafter Warmus (Pat.# 6,327,599, 12/4/01, filed 6/7/95), in view of Barnes, "10 Minute Guide To Windows 3.1", SAMS, 1992, p.119-123.

Regarding independent claim 1, Warmus discloses automatically intercepting a print job sent to a printer which completes the print job and adding additional variable information, which contain additional customized information. New information is added onto a static information template to produce several documents containing different information in a format different from the format originally sent by the user—data and template— (c.3, L.8-67, c.5, L.61-c.7, L.67, c.8, L.47-56). Warmus fails to explicitly disclose *a print spool associated with the printer*. Barnes teaches a print manager spooler for feeding a print job to a designated printer (p.119-120). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Warmus, and Barnes and provide a print spooler to keep track of the print jobs sent by the user, because Barnes teaches above a print manager for holding print jobs not printed by the printer. This would provide the benefit of tracking the printing progress, and keeping the print jobs in a queue, instead of losing the print jobs after sent to the printer from the user's computer.

Furthermore, Warmus teaches the printing of additional information related to a print job. The additional information is retrieved from a database using the variable data in the templates for retrieving additional information from the database or as a key for the database (c.3, L.8-67, c.5, L.61-c.6, L.67).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claims 1, Warmus teaches the printing of various books or book versions from the same single print job (col.7, lines 37-67).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claims 1, Warmus teaches the printing of various

Art Unit: 2178

books or book versions containing different or variable information which changes from book to book (col.7, lines 40-67).

Claims 5-6 are directed towards a tool for implementing the tool of claims 1-2, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 5, Warmus discloses the intercepting of a document template—*original format*— to be printed and using this information for the retrieval of variable data from a database. New information is added onto the template to produce several documents containing different information in a double-side printing format (col.3, line 7-col.4, line 12, col.6, lines 1-67, and col.7, line1-col.8, lines 1-67).

Claims 8-10, and 13-14 are directed towards a formatting tool for implementing the tool of claims 3, 3, and (1 & 3), 1, and 3, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 11, Warmus discloses automatically intercepting a print job, with static, and variable information—*first, and second portion--* sent to a printer and adding additional variable information from a database based upon the variable information or *keys*, which contain additional customized information. New information is added onto the template to produce several documents containing different information in a format different from the format originally sent by the user—data and template. One document having information not present in the other (c.3, L.8-67, c.5, L.61-c.7, L.67).

Regarding independent claim 15, Warmus teaches the printing of various books or book versions using template files, which have fixed data, and information for identifying locations for printing variable information (col.6, lines 1-67, col.7, lines 37-67).

Moreover, Warmus teaches the formatting and interception of data before it reaches the printer, and inserting variable data located in a database (col.5, lines 60- col.6, line 67). Warmus fails to explicitly disclose *a print spool*. Barnes teaches a print manager spooler for feeding a print job to a designated printer (p.119-120). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Warmus, and Barnes, because Barnes teaches above a print manager for holding print jobs not printed by the printer. This would provide the benefit of keeping the print jobs in a queue, instead of losing the print jobs.

Furthermore, Warmus fails to explicitly disclose *parsing the identification segment*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have parsed to identify the segment, because Warmus teaches the reading of variable template data to identify where to retrieve, and how to format the variable data (col. 6, lines 1-col.7, line 67).

Claims 16-18 are directed towards a method for implementing the tool of claims 2, 2, and 3, and therefore are similarly rejected.

6. Claims 4, and 12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus, in view of Barnes, and further in view of Ikenoue et al, hereinafter Ikenoue (Pat. # 5,987,127, 11/16/99, filed on 7/15/97).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 3, Warmus discloses the intercepting of a document template—*original format*— to be printed and using this information for the retrieval of variable data from a database (col.3, line 7-col.4, line 12, col.6, lines 1-67, and col.7, line1-col.8, lines 1-67). Warmus fails to explicitly disclose *whether or not information is confidential*. Ikenoue teaches the embedding of additional data about a document, such as whether or not a document is secret, onto hard copies of a document for security and copyright purposes (col.2, lines 24-67, and col.5, lines 1-col.6, line 67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Warmus, Barnes, and Ikenoue, because Ikenoue teaches above an effective document copy management tool.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 5, Warmus discloses the intercepting of a document template—*original format*— to be printed and using this information for the retrieval of variable data from a database (col.3, line 7-col.4, line 12, col.6, lines 1-67, and col.7, line1-col.8, lines 1-67). Warmus fails to explicitly disclose fails to explicitly disclose *second portion is a confidential portion*. Ikenoue teaches the embedding of additional data about a document, such as whether or not a document is secret, onto hard copies of a document for security and copyright purposes (col.2, lines 24-67, and col.5, lines 1-col.6, line 67). However, it would have been

Art Unit: 2178

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Corona, Barnes, and Warmus, and Ikenoue, because Ikenoue teaches above an effective document copy management tool.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 15, the Applicant submits that Warmus fails to teach that the data intercepted when it is sent from a print spool to a printer (page 6). The Examiner disagrees, because Warmus teaches automatically intercepting a print job sent to a printer and adding additional variable information, which contain additional customized information. New information is added onto the template to produce several documents containing different information in a format different from the format originally sent by the user—data and template (c.3, L.8-67, c.5, L.61-c.7, L.67, c.8, L.47-56). The variable information is added after the document has been sent to the printer. Warmus fails to explicitly disclose *a print spool associated with the printer*. Barnes teaches a print manager spooler for feeding a print job to a designated printer (p.119-120). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Warmus, and Barnes and provide a well-known print spooler(as taught by Barnes) to keep track of the print jobs, because Barnes teaches above a print manager for holding print jobs not printed by the printer. This would

provide the benefit of keeping the print jobs in a queue, instead of losing the print jobs after sent to the printer from the user's computer.

Moreover, the Applicant submits that Warmus does not support the teaching of intercepting the print job after it has been sent to the printer (pages 7-8). The Examiner disagrees, because Warmus discloses the insertion of variable data from a database into a document during the printing--after print command has been issued (col.8, lines 54-57).

Conclusion

- I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bradley et al. (Pat. # 6,466,328).
- II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about


Art Unit: 2178

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866
217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/14/05